

The Costs of Aggregation on Arizona's Document Usability Ecosystem

aka Storage and Presentation of
Electronic Court Records Code Section
Stewart Bruner/ COT / June 1, 2012

- Observations from e-filing implementations show clerks handle different ways
- Question at February 10 COT meeting
 - Should courts be permitted to electronically combine all documents received via AZTurboCourt or over-the-counter from filers into a single composite case file?
- Members felt not, but were concerned about impact on current court operations
- Requested input from those affected before taking any action

The Problem

- Staff drafted a code section
 - Four main content areas
- Held statewide teleconference on subject
 - Reviewed policy statements
 - Collected input from participants
- Revised draft document afterwards
- Recirculated with changes noted
- Posted for COT members' review

Process to Solve

- Store documents at no less than the granularity of their related docket events
- Allow downstream aggregation of files
 - Multiple case documents may be presented together for convenience of judges, and JAs as long as they are originally stored individually in the EDMS
- Comply with req'ts of 1-504, 1-506, and 1-507
- Take security into consideration

General Proposals

- E-Filing
 - Each submitted document is separately identified and transmitted, not combined into a larger file upon acceptance by the court
- Paper Filings Being Scanned
 - Submittal is left intact and scanned with cover sheet matching docket event, even if would be multiple documents in an e-filing
 - Condition will dwindle over time as mandatory e-filing shrinks number of over-the-counter filings to near zero

Policy Solutions

- Bulk Scanning of Historical Case Files
 - Aggregation allowed as long as a separate docket event is entered noting entire file scanned at same time
 - Don't have to use AJACS or AZTEC to have the CMS code – AGAVE and iCIS both have one
 - Must take security into consideration and mark event appropriately in CMS
 - Situation far less than ideal, but will dwindle as retention periods are met
 - Town hall reps recommended “closed” case requirement apply to LJ courts only

Policy Solutions

- Indicating Inactive Cases
 - For retention purposes, indicate when case becomes subject to no further action
 - Use standard “completed” code in CMS
 - Take into account renewals of judgment
 - Prevent documents from being added to storage, back-up, and offsite tape interminably
 - Applies to shared LJ EDMS operated by AOC
 - Superior Court clerks manage own storage on standalone systems; DTM will communicate deletions to CDR

Policy Solutions

- Securing Aggregated Files
 - Apply most restrictive security designation associated with any individual record contained within the bulk scanned file
 - Use standard sealed and restricted codes in CMS
 - Clerks' responsibility to mark appropriately
 - AOC will not provide public access to any documents associated with events having a security restriction

Policy Solutions

- E-Filing
 - Each submitted document is separately identified and transmitted by submitter today
 - No change in practice
- Disconnected Scanning
 - Users trained to docket, print, then scan
 - No change in practice
- Paper Filings Being Scanned
 - Requiring over-the-counter submittals to be treated like e-filings requires additional clerk labor, up to 5 additional in larger courts
 - Leave compromise in place as mandatory e-filing shrinks over-the-counter filings

Ramifications

- Bulk Scanning Historical Case Files
 - Same issue as open case, over-the-counter filings
 - Change in practice would require addition of clerks or discontinuance of digitization
 - Disconnected scanning process can accommodate bulk closed records; documentation available
- Indicating Inactive Cases
 - Superior Court clerks say doesn't really apply – have later events in bulk scanned cases
 - LJ clerks on shared EDMS already trained to mark
 - Change wording to apply to LJ courts only

Ramifications

- Securing Aggregated Files
 - Indicating sensitive data is no change in clerks' responsibility – just increasingly vital
 - CCI and ROAM have to receive standard Y indicators from CMS to successfully stop public access
 - Town hall participants requested onscreen label that records not appearing can be requested from the local clerk, to mitigate bulk file “over-security/under-transparency” issue

Ramifications

- Post draft code section on AJACA Forum and visit AJC subcommittees to publicize
- Collect comments and address
- Return to COT to get approval for final language before AJC considers
- Pass along requirement for “see clerk” message to CCI automation team

Next Steps

- Recommend staff post the proposed code section on the ACJA Code Forum and return to share the responses to comments collected and any language revised as a result

Motion